

her fighting spirit and tireless crusade on behalf of consumer rights. She was always looking out for the consumer, for public health, campaign finance reform, some of these still sound familiar, civil rights, and environmental conservation. She also played a critical role in President Johnson's war on poverty.

She became known as a principled consensus-builder with the political will to tackle the country's most pressing problems. After cancer took her husband's life, Maurine Neuberger led the fight in the Senate to put warning labels on all the cigarette packages, so when we read those today, that the Surgeon General has determined smoking may be hazardous to our health, she wrote that and made that happen.

At the time of her fight against the tobacco companies in the early sixties, her efforts were considered bold and radical first steps in educating the public on the dangers of smoking.

Senator Maurine Neuberger epitomized what public service is all about. We are going to miss her in this State. Again, she was a role model for the Nation. If all of us would just follow in her footsteps, we would have a better Nation.

THE HIGH COST OF HEALTH INSURANCE AND PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GUTKNECHT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I had a group of small business people in my office. One of the concerns that they talked about was the high cost of health insurance. Recently, I have had several meetings with senior citizens. One of the things they talk about is the high cost of prescription drugs. The two issues are related, whether we realize it or not.

Over the last 4 years, for example, the cost of prescription drugs in the United States has gone up by 56 percent. In fact, in the last year alone, the cost of prescription drugs here in the United States has gone up by 16 percent. One of the reasons that health insurance costs are going up so much in the last year or two here in the United States is the cost of prescription drugs.

While we are talking about what we can do to make prescription drugs more available to seniors through Medicare, it seems to me we also have to be looking at why is it that prescription drugs are so expensive in the United States.

I have been doing some research. I have gotten a lot of help from my friends, some friends at the University of Minnesota, the Minnesota Senior Foundation. We have heard a lot about these bus trips that are going up into Canada to buy drugs. The more I have

studied it, the more I realize that we in the United States are paying far too much for prescription drugs.

I believe in a reasonable profit. I do not believe in additional government regulation. But I also do not believe that we should be taken for fools by the large prescription drug companies.

Let me give some examples. One of the most commonly prescribed drugs in the United States is a drug called Prilosec. Prilosec is given to people who have ulcer conditions and some other acid reflux conditions and so forth. A 30-day supply of Prilosec in Minneapolis, Minnesota, sells for \$99.50. That same drug made in exactly the same plant with the same FDA approval in Winnipeg, Manitoba, sells for \$50.88. That is a tremendous bargain. Interestingly enough, that same drug in Guadalajara, Mexico, made in exactly the same plant under exactly the same FDA approval, sells for \$17.50.

Mr. Speaker, it really is time for Congress to do what we thought we did with the North American Free Trade Agreement. That is to open up our borders. My vision is that American consumers, and particularly seniors, could go to their local pharmacy with their local pharmacist who could set up a correspondent relationship with a pharmaceutical supply house in either Canada or Mexico, and ultimately we would force the drug companies to allow Americans to enjoy world market prices for prescription drugs.

Let me give some more examples of commonly-prescribed drugs. I might say to Members, this is available. Just call my office. This is a newsletter that was put out by an independent group called the Life Extension Foundation, the title of which is, "Are We to Become Serfs of the Drug Monopoly?"

They talk about what is happening here in the United States compared to the rest of the world in terms of the prices we pay for prescription drugs. For example, a commonly-prescribed drug, Synthroid, in the United States, a 30-day supply sells for an average of \$13.84. That same prescription for exactly the same drug made in exactly the same plant in Europe sells for \$2.95. Coumadin, which is a drug my dad has to take, it is a blood thinner. In the United States, coumadin, the average price for a 30-day supply is \$30.25. In Europe, that same drug made by the same company in the same plant with the same FDA approval sells for \$2.85.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the Congress to take action. The first thing I would recommend Members to do is call my office and we will send them out a copy of this newsletter. They can find out for themselves the difference we see in prescription drugs.

Secondly, I would ask Members to sign on to my bill, H.R. 3240, which simply allows for the importation of drugs into the United States without FDA intervention, drugs that are currently approved by the FDA.

Mr. Speaker, do not take my word for it. Actually, the Canadian government has done some of the research for us. The latest research, and I have a copy of it, from the Canadian government, confirms that drug prices in Canada on average are 56 percent less than they are in the United States.

The Federal government last year spent \$15 billion on prescription drugs. If we could realize just some of the savings by opening up our markets to competition and bringing our prices into line with world prices, we could have more than enough money to open up the benefit to people who are currently not covered for prescription drugs on Medicare. If we could save 30 percent, 30 percent of \$15 billion, Mr. Speaker, is \$4.5 billion. That would go a long way to making certain that every American had access to affordable prescription drugs.

The time has come to take action. I encourage my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 3240.

THE MILITARY FAMILY FOOD STAMP ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, back in March I introduced H.R. 1055. The title is, the Military Family Food Stamp Act. I sent last week a Dear Colleague to my colleagues in the Congress, both Republican and Democrat, asking them to join me in this effort. As of today, we have 91 cosponsors from both sides of the political aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I bring this photograph of this Marine, who is getting ready to deploy for Bosnia, because he represents 60 percent of the families in the United States Armed Forces who are married. He has standing on his feet his daughter Megan, and also in his arms he has his daughter Bridget.

According to a 1995 Pentagon study, we have an estimated 12,000 military families on food stamps. Mr. Speaker, I personally feel that one family on food stamps is one too many. It is unacceptable.

Last week I received a letter from the Fleet Reserve Association endorsing this bill. I would like to read parts to the Members. It is written and signed by the National Executive Secretary, Charles Calkins.

He wrote, and I quote, "The Fleet Reserve Association strongly supports your bill, H.R. 1055, the Military Family Food Stamp Tax Credit Act. The legislation would amend the Internal Revenue Code to allow a \$500 refundable tax credit to certain low-income members of the Uniformed Forces."

"The unfortunate fact that junior enlisted members must rely on food stamps reflects the inadequacy of military compensation. Although there was

progress toward closing this significant pay gap between military and civilian pay levels last year, more must be done, and this legislation helps address this reality."

I further quote Charles Calkins. He says, "Petty officers and noncommissioned officers are the backbone of the military services. They deserve fair compensation."

Mr. Speaker, I also want to read from the transcript of the television program 20/20, from June 25 of 1999. The show addresses the subject of our military families on food stamps, and the title of the show was "Front Lines, Food Lines." The reporter was Tom Jarriel.

Tom Jarriel talked to a number of military families during this interview who are struggling to make ends meet. I want to share with the Congress part of the transcript from this show.

I first start by quoting Tom Jarriel: "Captain Elliott Bloxom presents the Pentagon's point of view that while some families are struggling, they are the exception and not the rule."

I further quote Tom Jarriel: "We're talking to people who cannot buy an ice cream for their kids when the truck passes outside their home."

Elliott Bloxom says, and I quote him, "These junior people, we feel their entry wage levels are adequate. They are very competitive with the private sector. We find that there are other complicating factors—oftentimes a larger-than-average size family—which places an additional burden on that service member to manage their finances accordingly."

Now I go back to Tom Jarriel. Tom Jarriel says, "Still, the Pentagon has pushed for an overall 4.8 percent pay raise, up to 10 percent for selected troops—a measure now being considered by Congress. And this would be the largest military pay raise in almost 20 years."

Now back to Elliott Bloxom: "We believe that that amount of money, in addition to other services that we provide, should go a long way towards solving the economic problems of some of our most junior people."

Tom Jarriel: "Not so says Congressman DUNCAN HUNTER," one of our colleagues on the floor of the House. "DUNCAN HUNTER says, 'I think our military people have been betrayed. The pay raise will be 4.8 percent. The services are 13.5 percent below the private sector. We need at least another 8 percent pay increase to close that pay gap.'"

Tom Jarriel: "As an 18-year member of the House Armed Services Committee, HUNTER's district includes many of those on the food lines in California."

"DUNCAN HUNTER," and I quote the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) again, Mr. Speaker, he says, "These are our best citizens. If we

don't take care of our finest citizens, some day we're going to ring the bell for war and the folks aren't going to show up."

Mr. Speaker, I mention that as I close to say that we in America are extremely lucky to have the men and women in uniform who are willing to die for this country. I want to encourage the leadership, both Republican and Democrat, and my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, to join me in this effort to say to those in uniform who are on food stamps, we care about you and we are trying to help you.

PRAISING THE FLORIDA GATORS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mrs. Thurman) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am really here tonight to say how proud I am of the Florida Gators who played, I believe, their hearts out last night in the final game of the NCAA basketball tournament.

While the University of Florida lost 89 to 76 after a hard fight, they proved to everyone what they are capable of accomplishing. After all, seven members of the young team's ten man rotation are freshmen and sophomores, and their starting line-up blows from the energy of three sophomores and one freshman.

Despite this relative lack of experience, the Gators finished their most successful season in the school's history at 29 wins and only 9 losses."

□ 1700

Hopefully, all of these fine young men will be back to lead the Gators to victory next season but for now last night's game showed how far the Florida basketball program has come in recent years. The Gators made their first Final Four appearance in 1994, and last night marked the school's first title game appearance ever. No loss can possibly take away from that great accomplishment. This team has spirit and get up and go, and I know they will use this experience to gain even more ground in the future.

Following the game, Florida coach Billy Donovan summed up his team's loss against Michigan State veteran senior players like this, he said, "You have every reason to be proud of yourselves. You lost to a better team. Let this be a tremendous motivating experience for you."

I would like to encourage all Gator fans to attend the celebration at 7:00 p.m. Thursday night at the O'Connell Center at the University of Florida campus in Gainesville to pay tribute to this fine team. They deserve all the cheers and hurrahs they can get for their remarkable record-setting season, and we in Florida always look forward to saying there will be a next year. Go Gators.

BALANCING THE FEDERAL BUDGET AND PAYING DOWN THE FEDERAL DEBT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOBSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask everybody to sort of hold on to their hats and prepare for a presentation that could be a little boring but very important to everybody's future, to the future of our kids, to the future of our retirees that have already turned past 62 or 65 and maybe gone on Social Security, because what we do in this budget is going to make the decision whether or not future generations have to pay huge amounts of tax to pay for our overspending in this generation, and it is also going to determine whether existing seniors might have their Social Security and Medicare coverage reduced because of the unwillingness of the President and this Congress to face up to some tough decisions on keeping these programs solvent.

Let me start out with what is happening to our Federal budget. Our Federal budget this year is \$1.8 trillion. The debt that we have accumulated so far that we are passing on to our kids now amounts to \$5.7 trillion. That compares to \$1.8 trillion total annual spending.

Who is going to pay back this debt? It looks like every man, woman, and child in the United States owes now approximately \$20,000 to accommodate the debt that has been run up in this country.

Congress has a tendency, a propensity, to spend because usually it is to the political advantage of Members of Congress, it is to the political advantage of the President, to increase spending, to do more things to more people. So, therefore, when taxes became a negative because people did not want to pay their taxes, we started borrowing money. We have kept borrowing money.

Now, for the first time we are starting to reverse that course. Last year we had a balanced budget for the first time in 40 years. This year is going to be a truly balanced budget, and we are going to start paying down the approximately \$3.6 trillion that is owed to Wall Street.

Let me go back to the total public debt, \$5.7 trillion. Of that \$5.7 trillion, \$3.6 trillion is what we borrow from insurance companies, from banks, from investors, all the Treasury bills that you, I, investment firms, retirement firms decide to buy Treasury bills for. That is \$3.6 trillion.

Then we owe approximately \$1 trillion to the Social Security, Social Security money that over the years we borrowed and used it for other government spending. Then the rest is what